



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/932,515	08/17/2001	Jeffrey Jay Jacobsen	03424.P014	6329
8791	7590	01/28/2004	EXAMINER	
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN 12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SEVENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90025			NGUYEN, KIMBERLY D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2876	

DATE MAILED: 01/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/932,515

Applicant(s)

JEFFEREY JACOBSEN

Examiner

Kimberly D. Nguyen

Art Unit

2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 November 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Amendment

1. Receipt is acknowledged of Amendment filed 18 November 2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 11 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. (US 5,545,291; hereinafter "Smith") in view of Suto et al. (US 4,746,787; hereinafter "Suto").

Smith teaches device comprising:

a first substrate (253 in fig. 4) coupled to a second substrate (257 in fig. 4);

the first substrate 253 comprising a plurality of display/driver/integrated-circuit blocks 19 which are deposited onto the first substrate (figs. 1-7; col. 5, lines 37-58; col. 6, line 15 through col. 8, line 10); wherein the blocks 19 in the substrate 253 comprising an integrated circuit or a liquid crystal display (col. 13, lines 47-64; col. 14, lines 26-30).

Although, Smith teaches a plurality of display blocks, he fails to teach or fairly suggest a dedicated integrated circuit coupled to the display blocks; the integrated circuit, which is configured to receive a signal from an external source; and a single I/O coupled to at least one display block and the integrated circuit.

Art Unit: 2876

Suto teaches an IC card having an integrated circuit 2, which is configured to receive a signal from an external source by receiving/transmitting means 4, 5; wherein the integrated circuit 2 is coupled to a dedicated display 3 and controls input/output data displayed on the display 3 (figs. 1-2; col. 2, line 58 through col. 3, line 20).

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the data communication between an integrated circuit and an external source as taught by Suto to the teachings of Smith in order to provide a dedicated processor for every display block so that multiple images can be displayed simultaneously. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide blocks with display, integrated circuit and/or interface deposited onto the substrate due to the fact that it would be easier to manufacture the dedicated display block by the manufacturers (e.g., reduce processing time and to reduce the cost of manufacturing the display block). Furthermore, such modification would have been a mere duplication of elements as taught by Smith as modified by Suto for displaying multiple images, and therefore an obvious expedient.

4. Claims 2-10, 12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith as modified by Suto as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Jacobsen et al. (US 6,281,038; hereinafter "Jacobsen"). The teachings of Smith as modified by Suto have been discussed above.

Re claims 2-4, 7-8, 10, 12, 14-18: Although, Smith disclose a substrate is selected from a group consisting of plastic sheet; Smith as modified by Suto fails to teach or fairly suggest the substrate comprises one of a flexible layer and a rigid layer.

Art Unit: 2876

Jacobsen teaches a flexible and/or rigid substrate applicable for fabricating the display thereon (figs. 9A and 14; col. 1, lines 17-26; col. 2, lines 14-33; col. 5, line 41 through col. 6, line 4; col. 7, lines 6-22; col. 8, line 42 through col. 9, line 11).

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the flexible and/or rigid substrate as taught by Jacobsen to the teachings of Smith as modified by Suto in order to provide greater support and durability to the dedicated display device within the card; therefore, an obvious expedient.

Re claims 5-6, 9 and 13: Jacobsen teaches a display generation substrate is coupled to an active matrix back-plane (fig. 8; col. 6, line 53 through col. 7, line 5).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 18 November 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

6. In response to Applicant's argument that "As taught by Smith, none of the layer 253 or the layer 257 is a substrate that comprises a plurality of blocks. The layer 253 and layer 257 are both intermediate layers used or formed during the steps of forming and releasing the blocks 19. None of these layers end up in a device that comprises the blocks..." (see page 6, 4th paragraph); the Examiner believes that the Smith et al reference teaches the above limitation, given its broadest reasonable interpretation, wherein during the manufacturing process of the display device at that instant, the above claimed invention would have been met (i.e., a plurality of substrates including the blocks, as discussed above in paragraph 3). With respect to the "... Smith, Sato, and Jacobsen, taken alone or in combination, cannot teach a first substrate coupling

Art Unit: 2876

to a second substrate...” the Examiner respectfully requests the Applicant to review the above comment with respect to Smith et al reference.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimberly D. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-2402. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on 571-272-2398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-2402.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-8792.

Application/Control Number: 09/932,515

Page 6

Art Unit: 2876

KDN

21 January 2004



MICHAEL G. LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800